

COUPLING READING STRATEGIES AND LITERARY TEXTS: AN APPROACH TO IMPROVING READING

Mehri Izadi¹ and Esmail Zare-Behtash²

Abstract

The present study aimed to explore the effect of reading comprehension strategy use and literature on the improvement of the reading ability of Iranian EFL learners. An analysis of the use of SQR3 (survey, question, read, recite, and review) and TPS (think, pair, and share) comprehension strategies in terms of the learners' reading achievements was perused. Moreover, the differences between the reading of short stories as the source of teaching reading and adapted books were studied. The data were collected through a pretest-treatment-posttest design and were analyzed using *t*-tests and ANOVA. Results revealed that SQR3 and TPS groups outperformed the learners who did not receive any treatment. This indicated that merging reading strategies in reading short stories significantly improved the learners' comprehension level. The study suggests that instructors should be aware of the learning opportunities that arise in literature-centered readings, provide learners with and instruct comprehension strategies, and accordingly enhance the experience of reading in a foreign language.

Key words: Reading, comprehension strategy, SQR3, TPS, literary text

¹Mehri Izadi is a PhD Candidate in TEFL at Chabahar Maritime University, Chabahar, Iran. Her areas of interest are psycholinguistics, sociolinguistics, and assessment. She has authored and co-authored articles in reading comprehension and reading strategy use, vocabulary improvement, and CALL.

²Esmail Zare-Behtash is an Associate Professor of English literature in Chabahar Maritime University. He has been a visiting scholar in the UK both at the University of Cambridge and Oxford. He is interested in literature, lexicography, and language skills.

INTRODUCTION

Having trouble with reading courses or comprehension activities is among the difficulties language learners are always faced with. Reading is a complex cognitive process which coordinates and constructs meaning through multifaceted processes encompassing language, word reading, word knowledge and fluency. According to Millrood (2001), reading is “a visual and cognitive process to extract meaning from writing by understanding the written text, processing information, and relating it to existing experience” (p. 117). It is crystal clear that reading is an active process entailing visual decoding and mental processing of what has been decoded. Currently, it might not be surprising to state that reading comprehension is the central function for teachers and curriculum developers inasmuch as understanding what is read constructs the foundation for learning regardless of the content.

Over the years, attempts have been made to promote the learners’ reading abilities. Explicit and implicit instructions (Palinscar & Brown, 1984), applying different types of strategies (Oxford, 2002), scaffolding and involving learners in interactive processes (Vygotsky, 1997), cognitive skill development (Cummins, 1994) and boosting efficacious and regulation beliefs of learners (Bandura, 1999; Zimmerman, 2001) are among attempts undertaken to develop the readers’ functioning. One recent effort has been the integration of literature in educating ESL/EFL learners (Cullinan, 1987). Since 1980s, literature has been reconsidered as a teaching source as opposed to the 1900s, when translating, grammar practices and vocabulary learning were used (Lazar, 2008; Pugh, 1989; Povey,

1967; Oster, 1989; Arthur, 1968). According to Pugh (1989) and Povey (1967), literature is a rich basis for meaningful input which increases the students’ linguistic knowledge. It is an important source for improving in sophisticated language structures (Chomsky, 1972, McKay, 1982, Arthur, 1968), critical reading (Felsenthal, 1989), the use of interactive strategies (Morrow, 1992), discursive knowledge (Widdowson, 1982), critical thinking (Oster, 1989), a cognitive use of comprehension strategies (Tugman, 2010), down-up and top-down skills (Pereira & Vallance, 2009), and motivation (Khatib & Rahimi, 2012).

Povey (1967) defined the effect of teaching literature as nurturing a) all language skills, b) awareness of L2 culture, c) awareness of self, and d) creativity. According to Povey (1967), literature is a platform to create opportunities for discussions a natural and meaningful use of language and for the improvement of critical skills. In favor of the role of literature in teaching, Minardi (1994, p. 2) argued that

Psycholinguistic research indicates that meaning is not simply transmitted, but is constructed by the reader when he or she interacts with the text. Therefore, a reader’s background, past experience, and purpose, as well as the provision of real, meaningful texts are important in constructing meaning.

Literature benefits language learners by the help of stimulating the background knowledge through providing contextualized reading. Learners can construct and interact meaning with other learners. In other words, literature provides a civilized learning process

to encourage the learners' intellectual and emotional abilities (Lucas, 1980).

The study of literature has proven that the use of literature in teaching in the form of the short story and storytelling (Morrow, 1992; Minardi, 1994; Gallets, 2005; Kharaghani, 2013; Pourkalhor & Kohan, 2013), of literature circles (Marshall, 2006), and literature discussions (Donato & Brooks, 2004; Tugman, 2010) has significantly affected readers' comprehension. The present study was stimulated to further explore whether the use of reading strategies in a literature-centered course would replicate this significant improvement. The role of reading strategies in language learning has been comprehensively explored (Oxford, 2002; McNamara, 2012; Spörer & Schünemann, 2014). It is needless to state that reading strategies are cognitive or behavioral means to help learners identify confusing elements of texts, clear them up and improve comprehension. What would be the outcome in a literary-driven class? This is the question we intend to answer at the end of this study.

Concerning the purpose of the study, SQR3 and TPS, which are two practical types of comprehension strategies (Artis, 2008; Fisher, 2005), were applied in improving reading comprehension. SQR3 stands for survey, question, read, recite and review. Learners begin with a survey and go through the headings, sub-headings, figures and review questions to apprehend the text. In the next step, they question "how", "what" and "why" will regard to the reading passage. Following that, the learners complete three R stages: they first read the text carefully, then recite what they have noted, and lastly review their understanding from the text. The other reading comprehension strategy explored in this study

is TPS. TPS stands for Think-pair-share activities. The think stage urges learners to think individually about the title of the text or the question posed by the teacher. In the Pair stage learners should increase their understanding of the text by sharing and discussing their ideas with a partner. Finally, in the Share stage learners share their thoughts with another pair of students or a small group. A thorough explanation of strategies was presented in the method section. In this respect, the study was in demand of exploring how these two strategies work for the learners' comprehension of literary texts.

Literature Review

The study of pertaining literature has shown that literary-based instructions have significantly benefited language learners (Morrow, 1992; Minadri, 1994; Donato & Brooks, 2004; Gallets, 2005; Marshall, 2006; Tugman, 2010; Liao & Wang, 2011; Kharaghani, 2013; Pourkalhor & Kohan, 2013). In his analysis of the effect of literature-based programs, Morrow (1992) argued that children who received literature instruction outperformed in informal written and oral tests of comprehension. Moreover, children showed stronger feelings toward using literature in their class, "all components of the literature program strongly impressed both children and teachers" (p. 272). In an attempt to provide a curriculum which combines skill-based and meaning-based reading, Minadri (1994) incorporated children's literature into a thematic unit. Besides, critical reading and thinking skills in relation to reading, writing, listening, and speaking skills were investigated. According to the findings, literature is an effective means of teaching reading that

progresses higher-order thinking abilities. Literature, moreover, successfully “integrated the four language art components in meaning-centered reading experiences which, in turn, enabled children to read, write, listen, and speak more often and at a higher level” (Minardi, 1994, p. v).

Gallets (2005) further compared the effect of storytelling and story reading. To twenty-four students stories were read aloud and another twenty-five students, were told the same stories by a storyteller. The students’ ability to recall the stories, their language use, and their interpretation of story meaning were assessed. It is noteworthy that the two groups demonstrated improvement in their reading abilities, though storytelling learners showed a better recall of the stories. In an interesting study, Marshall (2006) explored literature circles versus directed reading activity in the reading achievements of middle school students. Students worked on short stories and were assessed on cloze passages. Although, there were no statistical differences in the two types of instruction, the interactions of treatment and passages, treatment and class period, and treatment and overall reading achievement were all in favor of the literature circle class. In a similar study, Tugman (2010) explored the practice of literature discussion groups on the reading comprehension of the 4th to 8th grade level students. Students in the groups were assigned specific roles with defined responsibilities. For example, summarizers were to point out important events to other students or students who took the role of artists providing a visual pictures of how the characters, settings, or actions could be looked upon. The literature discussion group did improve reading comprehension, the use of comprehension strategies, schematic

mapping, metacognition ability, and self-directing and self-monitoring. As it seems, incorporating literature in teaching, in any model, paves the way for language learners to make sense of what they read, and of what might be implied, and gives them the opportunity to interact and take responsibility in their learning.

Donato and Brooks (2004) explored the use of literature in relation to speaking skills and sub-skills, i. e. the ability to describe, narrate, discuss, and negotiate. Students participated in the discussion of literary texts. The analysis of findings revealed that the literary discussion advanced complex thinking in complex language. According to Donato and Brooks (2004), this literary discussion creates chances “to hypothesize, defend opinions, elaborate, and speak beyond words and phrases” (p. 195) and improves the levels of speaking functions. In working with Iranian students, Kharaghani (2013) assessed the differences between the use of short stories and that of reading-based textbooks in the reading comprehension of pre-university learners. It was concluded that the students in the short story class scored significantly better in their post-test compared with learners who received the traditional reading instruction. The study of Pourkalhor and Kohan (2013) on the effect of the short story on the reading abilities of advanced learners also replicated Kharaghani’s (2013) findings. It seems that Iranian learners show improvement in their reading abilities while using literature as their focus of reading practices.

With regard to the use of reading strategies, literature has reported the assessment of the strategies in relation to different variables. Pardosi (2013) investigated the effect of the TPS method on promoting the learners’

narrative writing texts. Classroom Action Research with two cycles and six meetings was done to collect data from 28 ESL learners. A writing test for quantitative and diary notes, an observation and an interview sheet for qualitative data were applied as instruments of the study. The findings of the study revealed that TPS helped to enhance the learners' narrative writing text score from the orientation test to the cycle 2 test. In another study, Andik (2013) explored the possible impact of the TPS strategy on the reading comprehension of first-grade learners. The results of the study showed that the mean score of the learners' reading comprehension was improved from 65.85 to 90. It denotes that there is an enhancement of the learners' reading comprehension if it is taught using the TPS strategy.

Baier (2011) explored whether integrating SQR3 into the fifth-grade learners' science reading strategies would improve their overall comprehension. The researcher adopted both the qualitative and the quantitative methods. Findings of the study revealed that the "SQR3 significantly improved the fifth-grade students' overall comprehension scores of expository texts ... [moreover] It was found that 68.7% of the students would use the reading strategy SQR3 in the future" (p. i). Studying the marketing students' reading comprehension, Artis (2008) strongly suggested that learners should apply SQR3 during their reading as the reading happens autonomously, and learners can retain more information. In the case of disabled learners, Alexander (1985) examined how SQR3 can develop the oral retelling ability of three intermediate-grade disabled learners. Story retelling, study characteristics, and answers to comprehension questions were the

methods of the study. The findings of the study revealed the positive impact of SQR3 on the learners' retelling.

It is safe to say that literature plays a significant role in English language instruction. Literature-based programs have proven that learners make deeper connections to the text, become motivated to interact with and learn from their peers, and encourage the reflective thinking of the learners. In the present study, we aimed to explore whether the use of strategies would benefit learners with regard to their reading abilities while exposed to literature. Exploring the effect of strategies in a literature-centered learning context can inform on the cognitive use of reading strategies and the learners' literary experiences.

This Study

The present study aimed to explore the effect of the use of reading comprehension strategies and literature on the improvement of the reading ability of EFL learners. An analysis of the use of SQR3 and TPS comprehension strategies in terms of the learners' reading achievements was conducted. Moreover, the differences between the reading of short stories as the source of teaching reading and reading adapted books were examined. In this regard, learners of the study were divided into four groups: SQR3, TPS, Control Group 1, and Control Group 2. The different effects of the comprehension strategy use were observed between SQR3 and TPS, the roles short stories had on the learners' reading skills was compared with SQR3, TPS and Control Group 1, and finally the findings were compared with Control Group 2, who followed the traditional method

of teaching reading with adapted books. In light of the objectives of the study, the following question was put forth:

Do SQR3 and TPS have any effect on the Iranian EFL learners' reading comprehension?

Subjects

Eighty Iranian EFL learners who were undergraduate males and females participated in this study. The learners were between 19 and 23 years of age, with the mean of 21. All of the learners had been the researcher's students for at least one term. The researcher selected them as he was aware of the learners' language proficiency and had their consensus on participating in the study. However, prior to the study, the learners took tests of language proficiency and reading skills. Nelson English language test (Fowler & Coe, 1976) was administered for checking the learners' homogeneity in English language proficiency. The Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) test showed no significant differences between the learners in their proficiency level ($F=0.31$, $p=0.81 \geq 0.05$) (Table 1).

The researcher also administered a reading test so that he could check the

homogeneity of learners with regard to their reading skills. The analysis of the reading test indicated that the learners enjoyed a similar level of reading proficiency ($F=0.20$, $p=0.89 \geq 0.05$) (Table 1).

Procedure

In the beginning of the study, after checking the homogeneity of the learners through the Nelson Test and a reading comprehension test, learners were randomly divided into four groups:

- Experimental 1 (SQR3)
- Experimental 2 (TPS)
- Control Group 1
- Control Group 2

The purpose of dividing the learners into four groups was to delve the effectiveness of and differences in the

- Comprehension strategy use
- Comprehension strategy use in a literature-based class
- Literature-based readings

Before implementing the treatments, the learners were asked to participate in a pre-test so that the researcher could have sufficient data for further comparison of the learners' pre- and post-test performances. In the first

Table 1

ANOVA test of learners' language proficiency and reading skills

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Proficiency Level	Between Groups	15.700	3	5.233	.312	.816
	Within Groups	1273.100	76	16.751		
	Total	1288.800	79			
Reading Skills	Between Groups	26.384	3	8.795	.200	.896
	Within Groups	3341.325	76	43.965		
	Total	3367.710	79			

experimental group, learners worked on short stories using the SQR3 strategies. Based on Robinson (1946) and Artis (2008), first learners should go through:

Surveying: In this step, the instructor asked the learners to survey or browse the stories by reading the topics, characters, events and the opening and ending paragraphs. Moreover, the instructor told them they could get help by looking briefly at any pictures embedded in the stories. The learners were required to survey the stories for not more than a few minutes.

According to Robinson (1946), surveying allows the learners to have a better comprehension of the main plots. This permits the learners to construct meaning as they are reading. After surveying the stories, the learners went through the second stage:

Questioning: Learners began this step by questioning about the topics, events and the author. In this stage, the instructor asked the learners to utilize the knowledge they gathered from surveying the stories as a basis to ask themselves questions that might be responded from the materials in the text.

Artis (2008) stated that by stimulating the curiosity of the learner, previous knowledge scaffolding happens and comprehension speeds up. Following the stimulating knowledge and questioning, the learners would read:

Reading: Learners actively read to search for the answers to the questions asked in the previous stage and underline or highlight the information that answered their questions.

Reciting: In the fourth stage, the learners tried to retrieve the questions and answers

from their memory. The instructor told them that they should not scan the stories for answers but try to provide an explanation, a reply or an example for the questions made. The learners could also take note and outline during this stage.

Reviewing: In this final stage, the learners glanced over their notes and went through the stories to learn the relationships within the events and found the main issues and details.

In the other experimental group, the learners went through the TPS reading comprehension strategy:

Thinking: First the learners were required to think individually about the topics of the stories or to answer a question. The instructor told the readers to ask themselves the following questions while reading the stories

- What could the story want to teach them?
- What does the topic of the story denote?
- What information do they already know about this story, the topic and the author?
- What questions do they need to ask their group?

Following that, the learners would do

Reading: In this stage the learners carefully read the stories and worked on the questions and gaps that occurred in the thinking step.

In this stage, the learners could write down notes or ideas as they brainstormed about the topic at hand and rehearsed what they wanted to share or say. After thinking about and reading the stories, the learners went through

Pairing: After independent thinking and reading, the learners were asked to pair up with a classmate. The instructor allowed the learners to pick their partners. The goal of pairing learners is to give them the chance to discuss ideas and thoughts and to provide an opportunity for them to listen and gain insights from each other. It was during this stage that the learners decided what they wished to share as a team about the stories.

After pairing, the learners in the final stage would do

Sharing: During the sharing stage, the learners revealed their ideas on the topics, stories and questions to the whole class. The group could decide what to share, or if there were disagreements; they could individually give their own thoughts and reasonings.

The third group was Control Group 1. The learners in this group were required to read short stories, ask questions whenever they felt difficulties and ask for a translation of the parts that they could not understand. Similar to Control Group 1, Control Group 2, the last group, received the traditional method of translating passages into Persian/Farsi for comprehension. However, they did not benefit from any reading comprehension strategies or literary readings during the course of the study. At the end of the semester, the learners were given a post-test so that the researchers could assess the effects of the intervention strategy and literature-based reading on their reading comprehension. The whole semester took 12 weeks: ten weeks of treatment (totally 900 minutes), and two sessions of pre- and post-tests.

Instruments

Reading materials

Modern Short Stories in English by Robert J. Dixon was selected as the materials for teaching reading in SQR3, TPS and Control Group 1. The book includes seventeen short stories on present-day life in the United States. The stories are easy to comprehend, characters are easily recognized, settings are directly explained, and the plots advance swiftly. For the purpose of this study, each story was divided into two parts and dealt with in two sessions. However, the learners in Control Group 2, who did not receive any comprehension strategy treatment or literature-based reading, were provided with *Mosaic 1 Reading* written by Wegmann and Knezevic (2002). *Mosaic 1* is a well-known book in Iran used in English institutes and universities for teaching reading skills. The book has flexibility and is easy to use, the texts are accompanied with a variety of skill-building practices, lively activities, and interesting and practical information about life.

Reading comprehension test

IELTS Test: The reading section of the IELTS Test was employed for pre- and post-tests to check the possible effects of the instruction. The test was taken from Cambridge Practice Tests for IELTS 1 (Jakeman & McDowell, 1996), Practice Test 1 and 2, which were published by Cambridge University. The IELTS test was selected as the main measure of reading evaluation in this study since it is a standard means of assessing learners' language ability. Practice Test 1 was distributed as pre-test. The test consisted of three passages with forty-one questions required to be answered in 60 minutes. Practice

Test 2 was applied to evaluate any possible changes after the intervention. The test included three passages with forty-one questions required to be answered in 60 minutes.

Reading Test: To gain evidence on the homogeneity of the learners' reading comprehension skills before the study, a reading test consisted of five passages with 30 questions examining the learners' reading ability in predicting the contents of the passages, finding the main ideas, answering detailed questions, and vocabulary items. Generally, the test included 6 predicting questions, 6 main ideas, 6 vocabulary items, 6 inferring, and 6 detailed questions. Each question was worth 1 point and the sum total of the test was 30 points. The passages were selected from the MA University Entrance Exam (Konkour) held every year by the Ministry of Science, Research, and Technology in Iran. The Cronach was chosen to check the reliability of the test (0.76).

Language proficiency test

Nelson English Language Test by Fowler and Coe (1976) was administrated prior to

the study for checking the learners' homogeneity in English language proficiency. The test contained fifty items: fourteen cloze tests and thirty-six structure tests.

Results and Discussion

Table 2 tabulates the descriptive statistics of the four groups on their pre- and post-tests' performances. According to the mean scores of the pre-tests, learners showed similar reading ability ($M_{SQR3}=20.38$, $M_{TPS}=19.15$, $M_{CG1}=19.95$, and $M_{CG2}=20.74$). To be assured of the insignificance of differences, on ANOVA test was run checking the mean differences of pre-tests of experimental and control groups (see Table 3). Table 2 further shows the post-test performances of the groups on the reading test. There were noteworthy differences between the experimental groups and the control ones ($M_{SQR3}=27.85$, $M_{TPS}=26.00$, $M_{CG1}=21.35$, and $M_{CG2}=22.20$). The significance of differences were further analyzed. However, even with insignificant differences, it can be noticed that experimental learners performed differently in their post-tests compared to the control ones, and that should be carefully studied.

Table 2 Descriptive statistics of experimental and control groups

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1	PreSQR3	20.3820	20	6.46713	1.44609
	PostSQR3	27.8500	20	3.81514	.85309
Pair 2	PreTPS	19.1500	20	5.66870	1.26756
	PostTPS	26.0000	20	6.10436	1.36498
Pair 3	PreControlG1	19.9500	20	6.41113	1.43357
	PostControlG1	21.3500	20	5.01865	1.12220
Pair 4	PreControlG2	20.7450	20	7.02513	1.57087
	PostControlG2	22.2000	20	3.70774	.82908

Pre-test					
	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	28.261	3	9.420	.229	.876
Within Groups	3123.848	76	41.103		
Total	3152.109	79			

The effect of implemented interventions were assessed through the paired sample t-test. As Table 4 reveals, there were significant differences before and after the intervention in SQR3 and TPS's reading achievements ($p=0.00 \leq 0.01$). The mean differences of pre- and post-tests (Table 2), accordingly, were proved to be influenced by the utilized techniques: surveying, reciting, thinking, and sharing. This implies that surveying the short stories, questioning the different scenes, reciting and reviewing the stories helped learners become proficient in the reading skills. Robinson (1946) asserted that only through changing the quality of the study method can learners fortify their performances in learning. Surveying allowed the students to browse the passages, become familiar with the characters, get a better comprehension of the main points and construct meaning as they were reading. Questioning activated the background knowledge of the learners and aroused their

curiosity. After carefully reading the passage, reciting helped the learners to scan the stories and find the hidden meanings within the texts. The last step, reviewing, improved the students' comprehension by recalling and reinforcing their memory. Instructing SQR3 for five days similarly showed some significant effects on the post-assessment of American learners (Baier, 2011). According to Baier, teaching the SQR3 strategy, even for a short time, will meaningfully change the way learners read and develop their comprehension. Alexander (1985) further argued that SQR3 techniques encourage learners to continue to handle reading and to respond correctly to a higher mean number of items. According to Artis (2008), SQR3 is the kind of practice used autonomously and privately and provides a thorough step-by-step framework of what a learner should complete and attain during reading.

Table 4 Paired differences in pre- and post-test administrations

Paired Differences							
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Pair 1	PreSQR3 – PostSQR3	-7.46800	6.67923	1.49352	-5.000	19	.000
Pair 2	PreTPS - PostTPS	-6.85000	2.53969	.56789	-12.062	19	.000
Pair 3	PreControlG1-PostControlG1	-1.40000	3.57477	.79934	-1.751	19	.096
Pair 4	PreControlG2 - PostControlG2	-1.45500	3.84993	.86087	-1.690	19	.107

By the same token, learners in the TPS group benefited from the treatment. As a cooperative strategy, TPS actively engaged students in class discussions and gave the learners opportunities to express themselves, to boost their efficacy senses and reach all aspects of competence. The analysis of the writing skills (Pardosi, 2013) likewise revealed that besides the undeniable improvement of the learners' narrative writing texts, the learners were more enjoyed and more attentive in learning narrative writing texts by using TPS. As it seems, in applying the TPS strategy, the learners were required to think individually and shared their opinions with their pairs and with the whole class. This puts the class into a pleasant and interesting context for teaching and learning (Andik, 2013; Jannah, 2013). The think time of TPS cultivated the learners' thinking skills, enhanced learning through pair and group sharing, increased the active participation of the learners in discussions, and enriched their level of opinions and thoughts. Furthermore, the peer interaction promoted group reflection. This motivates the learners to take risks and to express their opinions to a larger group since they had already tried out their thoughts in pairs (Carss, 2007).

Table 4 furthermore indicates that there were no significant differences between pre-

and post-tests of Control Group 1 who worked on short stories ($p=0.09 \geq 0.05$). It can be inferred that literary texts did not affect the learners' comprehension to the same extent as that of learners who applied strategies in reading literary texts. Control Group 2 who worked on adapted reading passages ($p=0.10 \geq 0.05$) also did not show significant promotion. It can be concluded that although learners showed improvement in their post-tests, the differences were not statistically significant ($p \geq 0.05$). It implies that learners who received no strategy instruction and literature-centered passages did not show any noteworthy development in their reading capabilities.

To further explore the differences between the performances of students in order to find which group has performed better, the ANOVA test was run. Table 5 demonstrates that there is a significant difference from the post-assessment of reading tests ($F=8.40$, $p=0.00$). It can be inferred that SQR3 and TPS statistically influenced reading abilities of learners. In this regard, the Post Hoc Tests were conducted to show which groups' showed significant differences.

Table 5 ANOVA test of post-tests between experimental and control groups

Post-test					
	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	571.900	3	190.633	8.402	.000
Within Groups	1724.300	76	22.688		
Total	2296.200	79			

Table 6 illustrates that Control students in group 1 ($p=0.00$) and 2 ($p=0.00$) showed statistically significant differences to the students in SQR3. Moreover, the learners in the TPS group performed significantly differently from the Control Group 1 ($p=0.01$) but not from learners in Group 2 ($p=0.06$). Moreover, the students in the two experimental groups, the SQR3 and TPS, did not reveal significant differences ($p=0.61$). After the treatment, the study shows that both interventions, SQR3 and TPS can significantly improved learners' reading abilities. In his study of different effects of metacognitive self-monitoring strategies, SQR3 and KWL on learners' reading competency, Prapti-Erawati (2012) argued that although learners with KWL scored better, there were no significant differences between learners who used different types of strategies in their reading

skills. The two strategies inspire learners, open up thinking, and create opportunities for learners to construct and reconstruct meaning. Likewise, Bowering, Leggett, Harvey and Hui (2007), assessing team working and the TPS, notified that collaboration broadens the learners' insight, rearranges the resources, and helps learners to put forward their personal views by relating to their experiences. It can be concluded that SQR3 and TPS have positive impacts on the learners' comprehension, help them to find the main ideas and supporting details and improve their thinking skills.

It is also worth noticing that the learners in Control Groups 1 and 2 did not show any meaningful differences ($p=0.94$), which implies that neither providing learners with short stories nor with traditional textbooks do not affect the readers' abilities.

Table 6 Post Hoc of post-tests

Post-test							
		Mean Difference (I-J)		95% Confidence Interval			
	(I) Group	(J) Group	Std. Error	Sig.	Lower Bound	Upper Bound	
Tukey HSD	SQR3	TPS	1.85000	.611	-2.1066	5.8066	
		ControlG1	6.50000*	.000	2.5434	10.4566	
		ControlG2	5.65000*	.002	1.6934	9.6066	
	TPS	SQR3	-1.85000	.611	-5.8066	2.1066	
		ControlG1	4.65000*	.015	.6934	8.6066	
		ControlG2	3.80000	.064	-.1566	7.7566	
	ControlG1	SQR3	-6.50000*	.000	-10.4566	-2.5434	
		TPS	-4.65000*	.015	-8.6066	-.6934	
		ControlG2	-.85000	.942	-4.8066	3.1066	
	ControlG2	SQR3	-5.65000*	.002	-9.6066	-1.6934	
		TPS	-3.80000	.064	-7.7566	.1566	
		ControlG1	.85000	.942	-3.1066	4.8066	

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Conclusion

The broader aim of the study was to evaluate the impact of strategy-based reading on the comprehension of literary texts by Iranian EFL learners. The study also compared the literature-centered reading classes with the traditional methods. The researchers hypothesized that the learners who used comprehension strategies and worked on short stories would show a better achievement than those who did not use strategies and worked on adapted books. The data were collected through a pretest-treatment-posttest design for homogenized groups. The ANOVA test of SQR3, TPS, Control Group 1 and 2 on their post-assessments revealed that there were statistically significant differences at $p=0.05$ between the achievements of the experimental and control groups in favor of the experimental groups (see Tables 5 and 6). This indicates that reading comprehension strategies accompanied with short stories have positive effects that assist the learners in promoting their language skills. Thus, it is worth considering that curriculum developers and instructors include comprehension strategies and literature in lesson planning, presenting learners with comprehensible and interesting language.

Similar to other studies in educational contexts, this research was constrained by the reality and complexity of the classroom setting. It was aimed to continue the procedures already begun in the reading classes, so full experimental control was not probable. The following limitations should thus be regarded in inferring the findings. The demands of institution-wide activities and programs intruded on lessons at times, putting pressure on the instructor to meet deadlines and

avoiding the extension of purposeful discussions and reflections, and the completion of follow-up tasks. There were times when the planned questions for the SQR3 and TPS activities and follow-up tasks moved away from those expected in regular teaching. However, it should be mentioned that although there were such limitations in the study, the treatments were planned in a reliable manner and could be replicated in other contexts without difficulty.

Although the findings of the study are sound and significant, the replication of the study with a larger sample over longer a span of time seems necessary. It is also suggested that researchers explore the variables across different language proficiency levels. Replicating the study in light of psychological variables seems interesting. Do comprehension strategies and literature have anything to do with learners' self-regulation given that, the regulated learners, to a great extent, direct and monitor the reading process. Further inquiry is desired for a thorough understanding of this issue and for establishing its results.

References

- Alexander, D.F. (1985). The effect of study skill training on learning disabled students' retelling of expository material. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*, 18(3), 263-267.
- Andik, A. (2013). Improving reading comprehension by using think, pair, and share technique. *JP3*, 1(12), 28-33.
- Arthur, B. (1968). Reading literature and learning a second language 1. *Language Learning*, 18(3 4), 199-210.
- Artis, A.B. (2008). Improving marketing students' reading comprehension with the

- sq3r method. *Journal of Marketing Education*, 30(2), 130-137.
- Baier, K. (2011). *The effects of sq3r on fifth grade students' comprehension levels*. (Master of Arts), Bowling Green State University.
- Bandura, A. (1999). Social cognitive theory: An agentic perspective. *Asian Journal of Psychology*, 2, 21-41.
- Bowering, M., Leggett, B.M., Harvey, M., & Hui, L. (2007). Opening up thinking: Reflections on group work in a bilingual postgraduate program. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 19(2), 105-116.
- Carss, W.D. (2007). *The effects of using think-pair-share during guided reading lessons*. (Master of Arts), The University of Waikato.
- Chomsky, C. (1972). Stages in language development and reading exposure. *Harvard Educational Review*, 42(1), 1-34.
- Cullinan, B. (1987). *Children's literature in the reading program* (Ed.). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Cummins, J. (1994). The acquisition of English as a second language. In K. Spangenberg-Urbschat & R. Pritchard (Eds.), *Kids come in all languages: Reading instruction for ESL students* (pp. 36-62). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Dixson, R. J. (1971). *Modern short stories in English*. New York: Regents.
- Donato, R., & Brooks, F.B. (2004). Literary discussions and advanced speaking functions: Researching the (dis) connection. *Foreign Language Annals*, 37(2), 183-199.
- Felsenthal, H. (1989). The tradebook as an instructional tool: Strategies in approaching literature. In J.W. Stewig & S.L. Sebesta (Eds.), *Using literature in the elementary classroom* (pp. 21-34). Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Fisher, R. (2005). *Teaching children to learn*. 2nd Edition. Nelson Thornes Ltd, Bolton, UK
- Fowler, W., & Coe, N. (1976). *Nelson proficiency tests*. London: Butler & Tanner Ltd.
- Gallets, M.P. (2005). *Storytelling and story reading: A comparison of effects on children's memory and story comprehension*. (Master of Arts), East Tennessee State University.
- Jakeman, V., & McDowell, M. (1996). *Cambridge practice tests for ielts 1. Student's book with answers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jannah, N. (2013). The effectiveness of think-pair-share technique in teaching reading. *JP3*, 1(12), 91-96.
- Kharaghani, N. (2013). *The effect of short stories on reading comprehension ability of iranian efl learners*. Paper presented at the Global Summit on Education, Kuala Lumpur.
- Khatib, M., & Rahimi, A.H. (2012). Literature and language teaching. *Journal of Academic and Applied Studies*, 2(6), 32-38.
- Lazar, G. (2008). *Literature and language teaching: A guide for teachers and trainers*. Ernst Klett Sprachen.
- Liao, H.-C., & Wang, Y.-h. (2011). Using appreciative pedagogy to teach literature to esl students. *Asian Journal of University Education*, 7(2), 21-34.

- Lucas, J.A. (1980). Developing reading skills through the short story. *Teaching and Learning*, 1(1), 20-28.
- Marshall, J.C. (2006). *The effects of participation in literature circles on reading comprehension*. (Doctor of Philosophy), University of Miami.
- McKay, S. (1982). Literature in the esl classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, 16, 529-536.
- McNamara, D.S. (2012). *Reading comprehension strategies: Theories, interventions, and technologies*. Psychology Press
- Millrood, R. (2001). *Teacher development series: Modular course in English teaching methodology*. Cmbridg: Cambridge University Press
- Minardi, K.S. (1994). *Using children's literature: An approach to teaching reading*. (Master of Arts), University of North Florida.
- Morrow, L.M. (1992). The impact of a literature-based program on literacy achievement, use of literature, and attitudes of children from minority backgrounds. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 251-275.
- Oster, J. (1989). Seeing with different eyes: Another view of literature in the esl class. *TESOL Quarterly*, 23(1), 85-103.
- Oxford, R.L. (2002). Language learning strategies in a nutshell: Update and esl suggestions. *Methodology in Language Teaching: An Anthology of Current Practice*, 124-132.
- Palincsar, A.S., & Brown, A. (1984). Reciprocal teaching of comprehension fostering and comprehension monitoring activities. *Cognition and Instruction*, 1, 117-175.
- Pardosi, P.S.R. (2013). Improving students' achievement in writing narrative text by using think pair share strategy. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Learning of FBS UNIMED*, 2(2), 301-312.
- Pereira, M.D., & Vallance, R.J. (2009). Implications of conducting naturalistic research in multiple sites. *The Journal of Educational Enquiry*, 8(2).
- Pourkalhor, O., & Kohan, N. (2013). Teaching reading comprehension through short stories in advance classes. *Asian Journal of Social Sciences & Humanities*, 2(2), 52-60.
- Povey, J.F. (1967). Literature in tesl programs: The language and the culture. *TESOL Quarterly*, 1(2), 40-46.
- Prapti-Erawati, N.L.P.E. (2012). A comparative effect of metacognitive self-monitoring strategies on students' reading competency based on text types. *Journal Pendidikan Bahasa*, 1(1), 119-130.
- Pugh, S. (1989). Literature, culture, and esl: A natural convergence. *Journal of Reading*, 32, 320-329.
- Robinson, F. P. (1946). *Effective study* (2nd ed.). New York: Harper & Row.
- Spörer, N., & Schünemann, N. (2014). Improvements of self-regulation procedures for fifth graders' reading competence: Analyzing effects on reading comprehension, reading strategy performance, and motivation for reading. *Learning and Instruction*, 33, 147-157.
- Tugman, H. (2010). *Literature discussion groups and reading comprehension*. (Master of Arts), Northern Michigan University.

- Vygotsky, L. (1997). *Educational psychology*: Boca Raton, FL: St. Lucie Press.
- Widdowson, H.G. (1982). The use of literature. *On TESOL*, 81, 203-214.
- Wegmann, B., & Knezevic, M. (2002). *Mosaic 1 Reading* (4th ed.). NY: McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc.
- Zimmerman, B. J. (2001). Theories of self-regulated learning and academic achievement: an overview and analysis. In B. J. Zimmerman and D. H. Schunk (Eds.), *Self-Regulated Learning and Academic Achievement: Theoretical Perspective* (pp. 1-37). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.